

# ***LUNENBURG PLANNING BOARD TOWN OF LUNENBURG***

Emerick R. Bakaysa, Chair  
Joanna L. Bilotta-Simeone, Vice-Chair  
Thomas W. Bodkin, Jr., Clk.  
Robert J. Saiia, Mbr.  
Nathan J. Lockwood, Mbr.  
Marion M. Benson, Planning Director



Tel: (978) 582-4147, ext 5  
Fax: (978) 582-4353  
960 Massachusetts Avenue  
Lunenburg, MA 01462

Minutes  
June 4, 2012

Meeting Posted: Yes  
Place: Town Hall, 17 Main Street, Lunenburg, MA 01462  
Time: 6:30 PM

Present: Emerick R. Bakaysa, Joanna L. Bilotta-Simeone, Thomas W. Bodkin Jr. Nathan J. Lockwood, Marion M. Benson  
Absent: Robert J. Saiia

**MINUTES – APPROVAL:** Motion, Ms. Bilotta-Simeone, to approve 5-14-12, Second, Mr. Lockwood, minutes signed.

**ANR- Daniel Cronin, 1 Turkey Hill Road-** The Board is still awaiting input from Mr. Cataldo, Building Official for this ANR. Ms. Bilotta-Simeone, Motion to hold approval of the ANR until the next Board meeting, Second, Mr. Lockwood, Motion passed.

**ANR- Alice Heikkila (owner), EPG Solar (applicant), 651 Chase Road-** Board awaiting revised plan labeling Parcel C as "buildable".

**EPG Solar Development Plan Review-** Findings and Directives read into record.

## **I. Background and Procedural History**

1. An application for a Development Plan Review was submitted on November 29, 2011 for 194 Electric Avenue, Map 077, Parcel 0014 and Map 078, Parcel 0069.
2. The order for a Development Plan Review was presented to the Planning Board by Zoning Officer/Permitting Authority Michael Sauvageau in letter dated January 9, 2012 (attached and on file in Planning Department).
3. The physical location of the proposed site is now defined as 265 Pleasant Street, per the Lunenburg Assessors' Office.
4. The Applicant is EPG Solar LLC, 5425 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 600, Chevy Chase, MD 20815.
5. Michael Borkowski is listed as principal of EPG Solar LLC.
6. The Engineer/Designer is Solar Design Associates, PO Box 242, Harvard, MA 01451-0242.
7. The name of the additional Engineer/Designer is Goldsmith, Prest & Ringwall, Inc., 39 Main Street, Suite 301, Ayer, MA 01432.
8. The owner of the property is Twin City Baptist Temple Inc. (TCBC), 194 Electric Avenue, Lunenburg, MA 01462.
9. The Reviewing Engineers for the Planning Board were Marsden Engineering, P.O. Box 509, Lunenburg, MA 01462 and David E. Ross Associates, P.O. Box 368, 111 Fitchburg Road, Ayer, MA 01432.
10. The entire parcel consists of approximately 188 acres.
11. The owner filed and received an approval for an ANR Plan for 47.203± Acres; ANR Plan dated January 18, 2012; Board approval date of February 13, 2012.
12. EPG Solar has a 30-year lease agreement with TCBC for 20 acres of the 47.203 ± Acre parcel subdivided by the approved ANR Plan.
13. The proposed use is a solar farm.
14. The project is for ground-mounted solar arrays.
15. The Application is filed pursuant to the Protective Bylaw of the Town of Lunenburg, Section 6.6. Performance Standards, Subsection 6.6.7., Solar Energy Systems.
16. The Application included Development Plan Review plan drawings.
17. The site will have day/night surveillance cameras.
18. The project proposed for solar use consists of a series of four (4) existing mowed fields running from West Street to the north behind the houses on Pleasant Street. The largest field is the eastern field and encompasses approximately 9.9 Acres. The field borders a wet area, an existing driveway and house, and woodlands to the east.
19. A line of trees, bushes and vines separate the site from fields to the southwest, west and north. This area is approximately 3.3 Acres in size and is directly behind the houses on Pleasant Street.

20. An abutter's yard extends into the field all the way to the wooded tree line to the east from the west field just north of it. A wood line runs along the north side of the abutter's yard as well. This area is approximately 3.9 Acres and runs behind more houses on Pleasant Street.
21. The area listed in #20 above is connected to the north field by a narrower strip of land, which is approximately 4.8 Acres in size.
22. The easiest access is from Pleasant Street.
23. The Notice of Intent was submitted to the Conservation Commission on January 8, 2012, for work required within the 100' buffer zone of wetlands.
24. The Conservation Commission held Public Hearings on February 1, 2012, March 7, 2012, March 21, 2012, and April 18, 2012.
25. The final drainage analysis contained in Whitman & Bingham Associates Inc. report (Engineer Brian Milisci [third party reviewer]) on April 4, 2012 was accepted by the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board.
26. The Conservation Commission Order of Conditions dated April 23, 2012 lists specific conditions prior to Construction, Sediment and Erosion Controls, Soil Stockpiles and Fill Storage, Land Subject to Flooding, Stormwater Management, and other conditions regarding fuel storage, removal of construction debris and erection of fencing (attached and filed in Conservation Department).
27. The following documents were presented for review:
  - o Geotechnical Investigation Report
  - o Operations and Maintenance Manual Report
  - o Site Visit Report by Goldsmith, Prest and Ringwall, Inc.
  - o Spill Prevention, Containment and Countermeasure Plan
  - o Site Plan by Solar Design Associates
28. The Reviewing Engineer's January 9, 2012 report (Marsden Engineering) outlined a list of specifics required for review (attached and on file in Planning Department).
29. The Reviewing Engineer's January 23, 2012 report (Marsden Engineering) notes that Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) dated January 20, 2012, copy of lease dated October 28, 2011, and Conceptual Plan dated January 2012 by Goldsmith, Prest and Ringwall, Inc. were submitted for review (on file in Planning Department).
30. The Reviewing Engineer's January 23, 2012 report (Marsden Engineering) listed additional information and documentation needed. Report noted no reduction in surface water flow to abutters. More plantings were shown and area of use is contained within area shown on ANR Plan (attached and on file in Planning Department).
31. The Reviewing Engineer's April 20, 2012 report (Ross Associates) on the evaluation of proposed landscaping for screening the proposed fencing and photovoltaic modules notes the change in fence height, type of proposed screening in the western view corridor and in the northern and eastern view corridors. While overall, the species proposed are appropriate, the plan does not consider the intent of the screening to be continuous and fully hide the fencing and appendages (attached and on file in the Planning Department).
32. At the April 23, 2012 meeting, the Planning Board rejected the submitted landscaping and screening plan described in #31 above and requested that the Applicant submit a revised plan that would fulfill the stated intent of Applicant to screen the solar arrays for the best protection visibly from the neighborhood.
33. The Applicant submitted an extended landscaping and screening plan to be presented at the May 14, 2012 meeting. The Applicant hired Landscape Architect Lorayne Black to design an extended plan. The plan increased the number of plantings by approximately 300%.
34. The Reviewing Engineer's May 11, 2012 report (Ross Associates) of the revised plan noted the Applicant needed to indicate if the entire fencing would have vines or if there was a defined limit, and that the cluster planting details omitted from the revised plan should be returned to ensure proper spacing achieved for the plantings (attached and on file in the Planning Department).
35. The Landscape Architect added two-foot berms to assist in catching rain water and not create drainage issues. Berms are also to raise the landscaping beds. An additional variety of plants were added to the site, including climbing plantings for the fencing.
36. There is an historic stone wall in the middle of the project area.
37. The Historic Commission responded to an inquiry noting that they have no jurisdiction over the stone wall (letter attached and on file in the Planning Department).
38. The applicant's engineer notes that the wall could be straddled by the proposed arrays, thus leaving the wall intact.
39. A Planning Board Public Information Meeting was duly advertised, held on January 23, 2012, continued to February 13, 2012, and closed on March 26, 2012.
40. Abutters within 300 feet of the site were notified of the Public Information Meeting.
41. Abutters and neighbors on Pleasant and West Street strongly object to this project due to close vicinity to their residences.
42. The abutters' main objections are to the placement in a residential area, the disturbance to their surrounding views, concern for their property values, concern over health issues, etc. (Copies of letters and electronic mails are on file in the Planning Department.)
43. A petition opposing the project was submitted to the Planning Board.
44. The abutters notified the Planning Board that position letters regarding the project would be forthcoming and desire to be part of the record (attached and on file in the Planning Department).
45. In letter dated May 14, 2012, Michael J Sauvageau, Zoning Officer, states that the newly voted Solar Bylaw voted at the Annual Town Meeting on May 5, 2012 requires that any solar project that shall require a building permit under the new Bylaw must conform to the requirements of the new Bylaw. The new Bylaw becomes effective the day it is voted, May 5, 2012 (letter attached and on file in the Planning Department).
46. The Applicant shall be notified of the date of the DPR presentation to the permitting agent under Zoning Bylaw, Section 6.6. Performance Standards, Subsection 6.6.8. in effect on the date of submittal.

## II. FINDINGS UNDER SECTION 8.4 OF THE ZONING BYLAW

47. The application submitted under Section 8.4.3. of the Zoning Bylaw complies with the submittal requirements. Specifically:

A. The application for DPR was accompanied by a plan, prepared and certified by professional engineering firm GPR (Goldsmith, Prest & Ringwall), Inc. See attached correspondence from EPG Solar dated January 18, 2012.

B. A Location map - Shown as Vicinity Map shown on Overview Plan was submitted with application dated as received January 25, 2012.

C. Name of owner of property and name of applicants as follows:

\*Owner: Twin City Baptist Church-Pastor, Erven Burke

Applicant: EPG Solar LLC, Michael Borkowski, Principal

D. Lot Boundaries, dimension and lot areas are shown as Vicinity Map shown on Overview Plan noted above.

E. Use, ownership and zoning of the lots subject to the application and of the adjacent land and the use of any building thereon within two hundred feet of the subject property are shown as Vicinity Map shown on Overview Plan noted above.

F. The plan depicts existing and proposed vegetation, ground culture or surface, including wetlands. EPG is proposing to remove trees within the array field indicated on plans noted above. EPG proposes to plant clover or similar non-invasive species to replace the current hayed grasses on the site. The clover will fix topsoil and its low growth characteristics will reduce the need for mechanical height control (mowing).

\*Reviewed by Peer Engineer for the Planning Board. See reports noted in Findings - Background and Procedural Data previously submitted by e-mail to Counsel.

G. The plan shows existing and proposed topography at two-foot intervals. Sufficient information is given to clearly indicate areas in the site, and within fifty feet of the site where gravel and loam removal or filling is proposed and the approximate volume in cubic yards. All elevations refer to the nearest United States Coastal and Geodetic Bench Mark (NGVD). No changes in grading, other than those created in conformity to the stormwater run-off plan and any changes required to provide drainage relief to neighbors as coordinated with the Conservation Commission and the Town Consulting Engineer are shown.

\*See Conservation Order of Conditions, previously submitted to Counsel and reviews Board noted in Findings - Background and Procedural Data previously submitted by e-mail to Counsel by Peer Engineer for the Planning Board.

H. The requirement that existing and proposed easements are to be shown is non-applicable.

I. Existing and proposed watercourses are shown on the Overview Plan and Conservation Commission documents previously submitted.

J. Plans must show all existing and proposed buildings, structures, parking spaces, driveways, driveway openings, pedestrian walks, loading areas, service areas, landscaped areas and natural areas on the subject's property and dimensions thereof. The project does not show buildings and will be unmanned and unoccupied. Overview Plan shows the structures are solar photovoltaic panels mounted on machine driven steel posts. Plans show the method of mounting, the method of driving steel posts, the structural layout of the facility and other details of construction. See Conservation Commission Order of Conditions. Also reviewed by Peer Reviewer.

K. Plans must show all proposed screening, surface treatment, exterior storage, lighting and landscaping, including fencing walls, planting areas and signs. Submitted plans show fencing plans, signage design and screening vegetation. Fence will be made of 8 foot grey chain-link fencing with natural screening in front of it. New design shows a 6 foot fence. Planning Board did not approve second presentation of landscaping and screening. A third presentation of landscaping and screening design was presented. Although more complete, it still did not meet all concerns of the Board. Noted in the minutes of May 14, 2012.

L. The requirement that plans show façade elevations of any new construction and/or alteration to any existing building or structure is non-applicable.

M. The requirement that plans show information describing proposed provision for waste disposal, refuse removal, drainage, dust and erosion control and other utilities and their appurtenances is non-applicable.

N. Photographs showing the proposed building site and surrounding properties were submitted showing overhead and complete site views.

O. Tables indicating, by zoning classifications, the required and proposed setbacks, side yards and rear yard distances, the intended use of the site, existing and proposed floor area and the use or uses of the floor area by square feet and number of units and parking areas with their locations were submitted. The proposed setbacks are in compliance with the required 25-foot setback for Residence A. The project has been designed with all setbacks to the fence boundary of the facility and the structures are behind the fence. Floor area and parking requirements are not applicable.

P. Environmental Impact Statement was prepared in accordance with the Planning Board Rules. The statement showed no impact to critical habitats, archeological areas or historical sites. The project removes no topsoil from the site, does not change impermeable surfaces, has no parking or permanent fixtures to the land. An historic stone wall is within the project. See also Background and Procedural History above.

48. The application submitted under Section 8.4. of the Zoning Bylaw complies with the performance standards set forth in Section 8.4.5.1. Specifically:

A. The plan submitted complies with Section 8.4.3. as described above.

B. Visual corridors are protected. A Landscape Plan and Screening Plan, prepared by Goldsmith, Prest & Ringwall Inc. was presented on 1/23/12. This plan was reviewed by a peer review. The plan did not fully protect the visual corridors for the abutters, particularly the West Street corridors. A second plan prepared by Lorayne Black, ASLA, Landscape Architect, revised above plan, dated 4/11/12 showed more extensive planting and coverage. All proposals noted that the plantings and screenings are expected to fully screen in a time-line of ten years. Noted in the minutes of 5/14/12 questioned the adequacy of the coverage. Representatives of the abutters also questioned same.

C. Landscaping is used to establish buffers between incompatible land uses, including plant type and location. See answers to B above. Additional concerns regarding issue is the project in a residential area as allowed in Bylaw Section 6.6.7.

D. Open spaces and pedestrian amenities are available to the public. N/A

- E. Access points, service roads, driveways, parking areas, lighting and pedestrian walkways. Access point (1), parking, lighting is shown on Plan submitted 3/26/12, Sheet 6 of 10 and reviewed by Peer Reviewer. Driveways and pedestrian walkways are not contained in plan noted above therefore N/A.
- F. Ease of access, travel and on site movement for fire and police equipment and other emergency services for public safety. As noted above see Sheets 6 of 10. Review of Fire and Police Departments agree with plan. Fire, Police and DPW Departments will received training for emergency services.
- G. Utilities are all underground. Yes-as shown on plan dated revised 3/26/12 Sheets 5, 6, 7.
- H. Surface run-off is minimized and the protection of the site and adjacent properties from erosion as a result there is assured. Yes, by report of a third-party engineering firm, Whitman and Bingham, submitted by Applicant. Report accepted by Planning Board and Conservation Commission.
- I. The relationship of the buildings to the site, including the siting of buildings, structures and open spaces is designed to permit passive solar energy and to permit maximum protection of pedestrian areas from adverse impact of winds, vapors, or other emissions, shadows and/or noise. There are no buildings shown on the submitted plans. There are abutters' concern via impacts of vapors and other emissions. Research shows no studies from state or federal government supporting any findings.
- J. The relationship of the buildings and site to adjoining areas, including compatibility with the prevailing architectural style and landscape and suitable transition to adjoining properties. Site plans first submitted 1/25/12 and revised to 4/11/12 show the project as a Solar Farm and show only placement in a residential area. See Sheet cross sections, sheet 1 of 2 and 2 of 2 depicting transition of project to abutters' properties.
- K. Historical considerations and compatibility with abutting properties and the area in which it is located are respected. Plans show a 300 year old stone wall on the property. The Lunenburg Historical Commission was asked for their relationship and a response letter dated April 5, 2012 noted that they had no jurisdiction over the protection of this wall because it is on private land. Applicant offered to straddle this wall with the solar arrays to protect it.
- L. Provision is made for maintenance of common areas and special features. The Applicant will be responsible for maintenance via Directives attached.
- M. The design of parking and off-street loading areas complies with the "Regulations of the Planning Board of the Town of Lunenburg Governing the Design, Construction and Maintenance of Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas." The plan calls for two parking spaces for routine inspections.
- N. The landscaping complies with the "Planning Board Guidelines for Non-Residential Landscaping." The project as a Solar Farm is a first such project in Lunenburg and therefore will follow a plan for Landscaping and Screening for protection of Visual Corridors.
- O. Architectural style, including facades, is consistent within the development and with the character of Lunenburg. There is no consistency of the Solar Farm projects that is consistent with the development and with the character of Lunenburg.
- P. Alteration of the topography is limited as nearly as possible to that which is necessary for the provision of access. Plans show little grading, mostly associated with landscape beds as shown on Sheet 11-12-13 of Landscape Plan, revised 4/1/12, and possible change with installation of arrays. Conservation Order of Conditions dictates more extensive allowable grading near the wetlands.
- Q. Appropriate surface treatment, landscaping, fencing, walls, planting areas and signage is provided, in accordance with this Bylaw and the applicable Regulations of the Planning Board. Surface treatment as shown on Landscape Plan, Sheet 5, 6, 7 shows grass coverage under the panels, plus gravel on the Access Drive. Plan entitled Landscaping and Utility Plan shows a six (6) foot fence while other plans showed an eight (8) foot fence. Minutes dated 5/14/12 noted the change. Signage will be submitted to Permitting Authority but will be consistent with Zoning Bylaw.
- R. Adequate size, location and screening of exterior and outside storage and service areas is provided in accordance with this Bylaw and the determination of the Planning Board. N/A
- S. Appropriate provision is made for waste disposal, water supply, refuse removal, drainage, dust and erosion control and other utilities and their appurtenances, in accordance with the Bylaw, other applicable Town regulations and other applicable regulations of the Planning Board. The Applicant shall receive a form entitled "Monitoring and Construction Procedures" which notes the above. There shall be an M&O Plan submitted upon request for permitting. Also specific instructions are in the Conservation Commission Order of Conditions.
- T. Adverse impacts identified in the "Environmental Impact Statement" are mitigated. An Environmental Impact Statement was submitted with application for Development Plan Review, Section 8.4. of the Lunenburg Zoning Bylaw. Review of this document shows consistency with the elements noted in this SubSection of Section 8.4. except for changes in Landscaping and Visual listed at (f) iii. There is no written statement showing plans for (c), (iii), (iv) listed as Recreation and Existing Neighborhood Land Use.
- U. Construction of utilities, including drainage, conforms to the applicable sections of the "Lunenburg Planning Board Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land." See (G), (H), of this report and Sheets 8 & 9 of Revised Plan 8 & 9 of Revised Plan 4/11/12.
- V. Project review, development and construction shall be monitored in accordance with the "Monitoring and Inspection Procedures and Fee System of the Lunenburg Planning Board." Forms will be added to this report. The fee has been paid.

### III. DIRECTIVES AND CONDITIONS

- 49. The Applicant shall present a procedure for monitoring the solar arrays and all the land in the project.
- 50. The Applicant shall report to the Planning Board per the attached sheet every Monday morning during construction (see attached). Further, the Applicant shall include in this report any problem during construction that affects/infringes on the neighboring residences' properties.

51. The Applicant shall cooperate with the Town Reviewing and Monitoring Engineer inspecting the project to ensure construction according to the approved plans.
52. The Applicant shall show that a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and a copy of the Notice of Intent have been filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Said plan shall provide schedules and details of the construction.
53. The Applicant shall not make any substantive changes to the plans or scope of work without submitting those changes to the Planning Board for engineering review.
54. The Applicant shall submit to the Planning Board and the Building Official a schedule of construction phasing, stabilization methods, and maximum areas to be unstable at any one time to prevent erosion or drainage issues.
55. The Applicant shall supply names and other emergency contact information to the Fire Department, Police Department, Planning Board and the Building Official.
56. The Applicant shall notify the Lunenburg Planning Board the date it begins the project and operation of surveillance cameras.
57. The Applicant shall provide the Lunenburg Planning Board all future information and correspondence regarding the Conservation Commission's Order of Conditions in regard to the Conservation Commission Directives so the Planning Board will have a complete file on the installation of the Solar Farm.
58. The Applicant shall notify the Planning Board of any problems/changes in the field that warrants an engineer's inspection as to how the noted problems/changes affect the previously reviewed plan.
59. The Applicant shall review the last Landscaping and Screening Plan to add screening for the complete fence and adjust the plan to include planting details omitted in the May 14, 2012 presentation.
60. The Applicant shall submit an As Built Plan prior to the final inspection.
61. The Applicant shall present a Performance Guarantee before construction as listed below:
  - A. Insurance in a reasonable amount determined and approved by the Planning Board after consultation, and at the expense of the Applicant, with one or more insurance companies to cover damage from structures and other site liabilities. Annual proof of said insurance shall be filed with the Town Treasurer or Accountant.
  - B. An annual maintenance bond shall be posted for the access road and site. Said amount to be determined by the Planning Board and Applicant. Date determined at time of closure.
  - C. The Applicant shall post a bond with the Town to cover the cost of removal in the event that the applicant (owner) does not remove the arrays and any accessory structures within six months of the date that the facility ceases to be used.

Board discussion ensued. Revised Findings and Directives above are as a result of that discussion. Mr. Bakaysa noted that action on the DPR needs to be taken under the old solar bylaw and that during telephonic discussion Town Counsel recommended that the Board take this action to conclusion. Applicant requested that the Board finish the DPR so they can move on to the next step of applying for a building permit and then take whatever action may be required as a result of the Building Official's decision. For purposes of clarity, some Board members desired discussion with Town Counsel for conversation relative to the bylaw and how it relates to the DPR, and associated scenarios. Mr. Lockwood, Motion to table decision on DPR until Board meets with Town Counsel, either via regular session, executive session, or telephonic conference. Second, Mr. Bodkin Jr. Roll Call vote – Mr. Lockwood, aye; Mr. Bodkin Jr., aye; Ms. Bilotta-Simeone, aye; Mr. Bakaysa, nay. An individual in the audience requested a copy of the DPR. Mr. Bakaysa responded, "When they become official – at this point they are still in DRAFT form".

#### **NOTICES & COMMUNICATIONS:**

Noted appointment of new Lunenburg Fire Chief

Noted building permits issued for Jacklyn Drive, Whites Woods and Sequoia Drive

#### **COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**MJTC-** No report

**MRPC-** Meeting held May 29<sup>th</sup>.

**School Building Committee-** Committee submitting paperwork to Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) for next step in process.

#### **PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORTS/NEW BUSINESS:**

**Highfield Village, Northfield Road-** Current Extension expires June 30, 2012. Extension request letter has been requested from the project engineer.

**Verizon Wireless, 314 Sunny Hill Road-** Requested modification currently being reviewed.

#### **DEVELOPMENT STATUS REPORTS:**

**Emerald Place at Lake Whalom, 10 Lakefront-** Five villas completed. Developer requesting meeting with Ms. Benson. Ms. Benson will get a status update at that time.

**Tri Town Landing, Youngs Road-** No report

**New England Farms, 134 Leominster Shirley Road-** Applicant currently before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

David Prokowiew, 733 West Street- requested clarification of Board's empowerment under the new Solar Bylaw versus Building/Zoning Official's empowerments. Also inquired as to why chain link fence versus solid fence. Response - climbing plantings will not adhere to a solid fence.

Paula Bertram, Select Board member- noted Montachusett Regional Planning Commission's Third Request for Service Delivery, which provides technical assistance to its 22 communities. Two of the eligible projects are, 1) identification, assessment and mapping of Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Priority Preservation Areas (PPAs) at the local and regional level, and 2) implementation of zoning and permitting changes needed to create predictable permitting of housing or commercial development within areas identified by two or more communities. Ms. Benson noted she has a planned meeting with MRPC.

**MEETING SCHEDULE:**

**June 18-** Master Planning Workshop, Ritter Memorial Building

**June 25-** Planning Board Meeting, Ritter Memorial Building

**MEMBER INFORMATION AND ISSUES:**

**Reorganization-** nominations as follows:

Chair- Mr. Bodkin Jr., Motion to nominate Mr. Bakaysa, Second, Ms. Bilotta-Simeone

Vice Chair- Mr. Bodkin Jr., Motion to nominate Ms. Bilotta-Simeone, Second, Mr. Lockwood

Clerk- Ms. Bilotta-Simeone, Motion to nominate Mr. Bodkin Jr., Second, Mr. Lockwood

MRPC Representative- Ms. Bilotta-Simeone, Motion to nominate Mr. Bodkin Jr., Second, Mr. Lockwood

MJTC Representative- Tabled to next Board meeting as Mr. Saiia, current representative, not in attendance.

School Building Committee- Ms. Bilotta-Simeone, Motion to nominate Mr. Lockwood, Second, Mr. Bodkin Jr.

All above nominations passed.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Motion, Mr. Bakaysa, Second, Ms. Bilotta-Simeone, Motion passed. Adjourned 8:25 PM.